

REMARKS

Introduction

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9-12, 15, 16, 19 and 20 have been amended. Claims 7, 8, 17 and 18 have been canceled. New claims 39 and 40 have been added. The application now includes claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9-12, 15, 16, 19, 20, 39 and 40. Reconsideration of the rejection of the application is respectfully requested in view of the claim amendments and the following remarks.

An RCE is being filed herewith.

The Claims are Allowable because the Prior Art Fails to Disclose copying an Application As Claimed

Claims 1, 5-12 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by O'Shaughnessy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,219,302, "O'Shaughnessy"). Reconsideration of these rejections is respectfully requested because the prior art fails to disclose copying an application as recited in the pending claims.

One embodiment is system for copying an application that includes-file system structures, including a data table and corresponding schema. See corresponding U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0143785, ¶ 22. The system initializes a resulting file and creates a root directory within the resulting file. See *id.*, ¶ 28; Figs. 2 and 3. The system creates an application level data directory under the root directory and creates one or more storage objects under the application level directory. See *id.* The system then stores a structural description of the application in a first storage object and creates one or more data table directories under the application level data directory based on the structural

description. See *id.*, ¶ 29; Figs. 2 and 3. The system then copies the data table in a second storage object and the schema in a third storage object, so that the second storage object and third storage object are under a first data table directory. See *id.* Embodiments allow the application, if it is a web based application, to be copied in a database and operating system independent manner.

O'Shaughnessy discloses a user interface for files in a common folder. See O'Shaughnessy, Abstract. Storing files in a folder inherently involves copying the files. However, O'Shaughnessy fails to disclose the majority of the recited functionality of claim 1 or the other present claims, which allow an application such as a web based application, to be copied in a database and operating system independent manner. The remaining cited prior art also fails to disclose the claimed functionality.

In contrast to O'Shaughnessy, amended independent claim 1 recites "storing a structural description of the application in a first storage object" and "copying the data table in a second storage object and the schema in a third storage object." For at least these reasons, amended independent claim 1, amended independent claim 11, and new claim 39, which recite similar limitations, should now be allowable over the cited prior art. The remaining claims depend from one of the above independent claims and should also be allowable for at least the above reasons.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests favorable action in connection with this application.

The Examiner is invited and urged to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter concerning this application.

A one-month extension fee should be charged for this filing. Should any other fee be required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any such fee to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 11, 2009

/Barry S. Goldsmith/
Barry S. Goldsmith
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 39,690

Customer No. 74739
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Vienna, Virginia 22182-6212
Telephone: 703-720-7876
Fax: 703-720-7802

BSG:sjm